

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

CHADRICK BARKWELL, §
TDCJ-CID NO. 680166, §
Plaintiff, §
v. § CIVIL ACTION NO. H-12-1034
SHEILA A. TORRES, et al., §
Defendants. §

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

The plaintiff in this case has not responded to the court's Order of April 11, 2012, which required the plaintiff to submit within thirty days a more definite statement of the facts on which his complaint is based. See Order for More Definite Statement, Docket Entry No. 5. The court's Order specifically stated that "If failure to comply as directed may result in the dismissal of this action." Id. at 5. The plaintiff's failure to pursue this action leads the court to conclude that he lacks due diligence.

Therefore, under the inherent powers necessarily vested in a court to manage its own affairs, the court concludes that dismissal for want of prosecution is appropriate. See FED. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Link v. Wabash R.R., 82 S.Ct. 1386 (1962); Woodson v. Surgitek, Inc., 57 F.3d 1406, 1417 (5th Cir. 1995).

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that this action be **DISMISSED** **without prejudice** for want of prosecution.

The Clerk shall provide copies of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to the parties.

SIGNED at Houston, Texas, on this the 30th day of May, 2012.



SIM LAKE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE